

# INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION AND PEACE.

## THE MISSION OF AMERICA IN THE POLITICS OF THE WORLD.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1909.

Mr. BARTHOLDT said:

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the authority granted by the House, I beg leave to insert in the RECORD the following addresses recently delivered by Hon. JAMES A. TAWNEY, Mr. Andrew Carnegie, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, and your humble servant on the subject of arbitration and peace:

ADDRESS OF HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT AT THE SECOND NATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS, AT CHICAGO, MAY 4, 1909.

The world is governed not by men, not by parties, but by ideas. The idea which gave birth to this notable congress is the greatest moral issue now confronting this as well as all other nations of the earth, and it is not optimism, but deliberate judgment, which prompts me to believe that when this idea has once penetrated the minds and hearts of the masses, it will sweep the world.

Our great difficulty is in making people understand it. The cause of justice, which we plead, is usually wrapped up in large words; it presupposes some knowledge of law, and is, on the whole, so complicated as to baffle a common school education. And, what is worse, it is invisible. You can not see or grasp it. From childhood on man is constantly impressed with the splendid paraphernalia of war. As children we play with toy soldiers; in school we find war glorified in the text-books we have to read; as youths we are taught that patriotism requires our joining the militia; and as men our eyes are dazzled with shining uniforms and our ears are filled with martial music. We see splendid monuments erected to perpetuate the memories of war, and, lest we forget our great battle ships, these monsters of the sea are sent around the world to make sure that the people are reminded of their existence every day for the period of a whole year.

Against all these machinations which impress the minds of the people, through eyes and ears, with the glory of militarism and war, the friends of world-wide peace are at a great disadvantage, for, as I have said before, the weapons they employ in their war upon war are invisible and the progress of their cause can not be seen. Their weapon consists simply in an appeal to reason and their progress exists only in the minds of men. But despite this disadvantage, let me tell you that all the clap-trap of militarism will avail nothing in the end as against the resistless force of our idea.

What, then, is our idea? Let me present it to you in a nutshell. It is that our peace with foreign nations shall be secured in exactly the same manner as our domestic peace is secured, namely, by referring all controversies to the courts for settlement. This method of settling disputes has been enacted into law by every civilized nation in order to secure its peace at home, and we insist that each nation should readily consent to, aye, strive for, similar international enactments in order to secure its peace abroad.

Is this plain enough? But you will see it still more plainly by raising yourselves a little above the level to take a bird's-eye view of the world and watch the attitude of the nations toward their own citizens, on the one hand, and toward their sister nations, on the other. You will observe at a glance that the nations are two-faced and that their position is so shockingly inconsistent as to be wholly untenable before the forum of either reason or morality. Let me point out to you some of those inconsistencies. By authority of the nation's law you and I are forbidden to arm ourselves and to take the law in our own hands in case of a controversy with a neighbor.

In the interest of peace the law points to the courts as our only rightful recourse. Query: Do the nations themselves observe this rule of conduct laid down by their own law? No; they do not even think of it. They maintain armaments and go on building battle ships, and in case of a controversy they go to war and fight. At least they have done it, and as yet we have not got them



where they will say: We will not do it again. At home nations prohibit fighting and the carrying of weapons in the interest of peace, but abroad they glorify preparedness to fight and armaments as the only guarantees of peace. In other words, governments do not regard the obligation to keep the peace, imposed on the citizen by the nation's law, as binding upon the nation itself, and by praising battle ships as implements of peace they actually repudiate their own civic institutions. Peace between individuals is to be maintained by law; peace between nations by force. And what is the result of these contradictions? That the nation's peace, which our civilization safeguards as the most priceless boon at home, is in foreign affairs made a mere toy, a plaything in the hands of governments and rulers to be either cherished or broken at their arbitrary will.

There are more inconsistencies. It is universally recognized that no man should be a judge in his own case. This plain dictate of justice requires no explanation and is enforced wherever human interests clash. Every nation on earth having a lawful government insists upon a strict observance of this rule within its own domain. But does the nation itself, in its dealings with other nations, observe it? Not in the least. In international disputes each government presumes to be judge in its own case, and upon its decision, right or wrong, depend the happiness and lives of thousands of its citizens. How long, we may well ask, will the world's sense of justice suffer governments to thus apply one code of ethics to their home affairs and another one to their foreign relations? In a dispute are governments any less interested parties than are individuals in a quarrel, and should nations be permitted to judge their own case any more than individuals, especially where the question of right or wrong is one of life or death, peace or war?

Suppose we could turn the hands of the clock backward and allow individuals to do as nations do by shaping our home conduct after the international pattern, do you know what would happen? Why, we would relapse into barbarism; the mailed hand would rule; every house would be an arsenal; men would walk about armed to their teeth; and blood would constantly flow foot high. It is the kind of peace that prevailed when might was right; it is the peace which now prevails as between nation and nation and which the advocates of armaments and battle ships uphold and pray for. But we can not go backward; we must go forward; hence the rule of arbitrary power which now controls international relations will not be extended to our domestic affairs, but, on the contrary, the mantle of law and order which now covers the home affairs of each nation will soon be thrown over and made to cover and grace all the great nations in their conduct toward each other. It is the inevitable logic of events. By establishing courts the nations first secured justice and peace in their own domain; by creating the high court at The Hague they have taken the next step to a higher plane to secure justice and peace in their relations with each other.

I wonder if you fully realize the world's progress in the direction of international justice. As I said, it is not visible to the eye, but it is a reality all the same. Within the last five years more than 80 treaties of obligatory arbitration have been concluded between the nations, our own country being a party to 23 of them. This means that certain questions must be arbitrated, while all others may be arbitrated by voluntary action. Twice within the last ten years a parliament of man has met at The Hague, with 26 nations attending the first and 44 attending the second meeting, to deliberate how judicial decisions may be substituted for war, how the blindfolded Goddess of Justice may be enthroned where brute force holds undisputed sway.

A world's tribunal to sit in judgment over the nations' controversies was established at the first meeting, and at the second it was voted to make that court a permanent institution, and all it needs to-day to insure to us the boon of a world judiciary is the appointment of the permanent judges. And more than that, The Hague Conference resolved to meet again to perfect the system of world organization, so that we practically have a permanent high court of arbitration as well as an international council of peace. Who would have dreamt even ten years ago of such a marvelous advance? Public opinion in favor of peace has become so powerful that 35 nations voted for obligatory arbitration, and they represented, in round figures, 1,300,000,000 inhabitants, as against 9 nations with a little over 200,000,000 people who either refrained from voting or voted against it. A vote of 6 to 1, mind you, by the governments. If the people themselves could vote, they would be sure to make it 16 to 1. Was it an exaggeration to say that our ideas are sweeping the world with resistless force?



The idea of a world organization on the basis of law and justice should and does appeal to Americans more strongly than to other nations because they know that the United States is a model for it. Here are 47 States with their own constitutions, their own codes of law, their own legislatures, and their own governments. Yet when a controversy arises between two of the States do the people become excited, are they seized by the war fever and a thirst for blood? When it was charged that the Chicago Drainage Canal was polluting the Mississippi River did Missouri call out her militia to go to war with Illinois? Bless you, no. The people of Missouri coolly prepared the case for the Supreme Court of the United States, argued it, and calmly awaited the decision. Is there any valid reason, I ask you, economical, moral, or other, why differences between nations could not be submitted in a similar manner to a supreme court of the world?

All reasonable beings are agreed that war is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of the evils with which the world has been afflicted from the dawn of history. But while the human family for more than two thousand years bewailed the horrors of that "plague of mankind," as Washington called it, it failed to offer a right remedy. That remedy has now been found. It is safe and sane and practical. It is not the dream of theorists, but the well-defined plan of jurists and statesmen, an evolution of the civic order recognized the world over. The United States now spends over three hundred million dollars a year for its army and navy, of which two hundred millions could easily be saved under our plan, to be devoted to the improvement of rivers and harbors and highways, and to the encouragement of art, science, and education. Think of what a paradise the country could be made with an annual expenditure of two hundred millions for such purposes, or what burdens could be lifted from the shoulders of the people! We are told that the enormous sacrifice for militarism is necessary to preserve the peace. We answer there is a better and more economical way to do it, and one more in harmony with the culture of the twentieth century, and that way is for nations to simply agree to keep the peace and arbitrate whatever differences may arise. In the last hundred years 260 international controversies have been adjusted by arbitration, and in not a single instance did the losing party try to evade the verdict by force or otherwise. Hence our plan has been amply tested. It is supported by an enlightened public opinion, which is stronger than either armies or navies, and it has the blessing of the noblest and best of mankind.

The world is slowly, but surely, rallying around the banners of peace. It gravitates in an ascending line to the higher plane of one common brotherhood, where the shedding of human blood for the sake of trade or any other purpose is regarded as a relic of barbarism, and where the three watchwords of a new world organization will be humanity, justice, and peace. In this onward march the United States should lead. It will be the fulfillment of our country's sublime mission. It will lend a new significance to the flag and will cause all mankind to bless the Stars and Stripes as the emblem of their salvation as well as ours.

---

ADDRESS OF HON. J. A. TAWNEY AT THE NATIONAL PEACE CONGRESS, CHICAGO, MAY 5, 1909.—THE COST OF ARMED PEACE.

The modern national state is a vastly different political organization from the ancient and medieval empire. Part of this difference is of great significance in the discussion of international peace. As late as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when the modern state arose from the ruins of the old Roman Empire, it was commonly believed by the world's political leaders that there could be but one great nation at a given time and that any nation to become great must conquer the wealth and enslave the people of other nations. From this conception of the relations of nations to each other it followed that no nation could hope to remain long dominant in world politics, and that every full bloom of national splendor and power must be followed by a period of decline and decay. Coalitions of foreign foes, want of patriotism, and the loss of individual manhood, which luxury and overcivilization always bring to a people supported by slaves, were ever present to threaten and destroy the dominant nation.

Even the Bourbon kings of France, as late as the reign of Louis the XIV, believed themselves to be, each in his time, the viceroys of God on earth. Not only did they believe themselves to be rulers by divine right, but they likewise believed it to be their duty as the viceroys of God to surpass all other kings in the splendor of their courts, to intimidate and subjugate abroad and at home, to imitate the glory of God in the splendor of their palaces, in the sumptuousness of their tables, and in the costliness of their costumes and retinues. To this



end they carried on perpetual warfare with other kings, and to this end they taxed their own people until revolution became a necessity and the only means of escape from the war burdens that were crushing the people to earth.

In the world march of civilization all this has changed, until to-day we hold that the greatness of a nation rests not upon conquered wealth and the bent backs of slaves, but upon its natural resources and upon the industry, the intelligence, and the patriotism of the individual citizen. To-day we realize that there must be as many nations coexistent on the earth as geographical, racial, and historical conditions make necessary. We regard wars carried on merely for territorial acquisition or national aggrandizement as national robberies. The character of a nation is judged to-day by the same standards as the character of the individual man.

It is clear to all intelligent people at the opening of the twentieth century that there is no law growing out of the necessary relations of nations to each other which makes it inevitable that every great nation must, sooner or later, decline and ultimately fall. There is no inherent reason why nations should not exist and grow great side by side as long as geographical and climatic conditions remain approximately unchanged. Indeed, there are abundant reasons to-day why no nation can attain to the full measure of its greatness except through relations of mutual helpfulness with every other nation.

We have entered upon an era of national specialization where all nations are more or less interdependent, where each nation relies upon other nations for some of the necessities of its life, where no nation lives to itself alone, and where none can perish without loss to the world. International commerce, international trade, international language, art, and literature, international political influence and example all demand that permanent peace be maintained among all nations.

The question for the world to determine is, Shall this be an armed peace, or will the nations of the world recognize the authority and acquiesce in the decisions of a world-wide federation, thereby insuring international peace without the cost incident to the preparation for war? Such a federation or international state would be but a slight step forward in comparison with the substitution of the authority of the national states in the settlement of conflicts between warring clans and tribes, or with the substitution of publicly administered justice for the régime of private warfare and individual retaliation.

But because of the inherent selfishness and mutual distrust of nations it is said by the advocates of an armed peace that the creation of an international state through the federation of the civilized nations of the world is impossible, and that this splendid achievement can be attained only through the instrumentality of powerful armies and navies which will make reasonably certain the defeat of any nation that might initiate and carry on war against another nation. If this be so, then international peace means an armed peace, and that kind of peace can not endure between nations relatively longer than between individuals. It will inevitably hasten the event for which the nations are now preparing.

The possession of irresponsible power is always a direct temptation to its irresponsible use. Individual citizens are not allowed in times of peace to go armed among their fellow-citizens because of the temptation to use arms for slight cause in such moments of excitement as every man is liable to in the course of daily experience. Just so there is a danger that nations, upon slight provocation, will declare war when each knows itself to be dangerously armed and fully prepared for war. Great armaments, therefore, instead of being a guaranty of peace are a continued menace to peace.

Whether or not the advocates of an armed peace are sincere in contending that peace can be insured only by the aid of great armaments permanently maintained, in the light of all the facts I believe it to be indisputably true that they are more concerned over the question of whether or not their respective nations can successfully compete in the international race now on between the principal nations of the world for supremacy in the size of battle ships and in the number of the largest-sized battle ships the world has ever seen than they are concerned over the question of how best to insure permanent international peace. This mad international race for supremacy in war preparation is all the more astounding because it is taking place at a time when there is no cloud on the international horizon to threaten the existing peaceful relations between all the nations of the world, unless it is occasioned by the senseless rivalry among the nations to excel in martial preparation. To my mind this extensive preparation constitutes a most serious menace to the peace of the



world, for it tends naturally in the direction of war even though its alleged purpose is the prevention of war.

I am not alone in contending that national ambition, not the fear of war or the desire for peace, is the prime motive prompting the principal nations of the world to the expenditure of larger sums for war purposes, including battle ships, than the world has ever before witnessed. Mr. Asquith, the premier of England, when discussing the English naval budget a year ago, pronounced a solemn condemnation of the English policy of constructing battle ships of the *Dreadnought* type, a policy initiated three years before, when the keel of the first great *Dreadnought* was laid. He said:

"We do not wish to take a lead, but we want to do everything in our power to prevent a new spurt in competitive shipbuilding between the great naval powers." "Competitive shipbuilding," not competitive peace building, is the prime cause for the enormous war-tax burdens placed upon the people.

The annual expenditures of the United States, England, Germany, and France, on account of preparation for war, or, as it is said, that war may be prevented, are to-day greater than the annual expenditures of any one of these nations during any foreign war in which it has ever engaged. In fact, these expenditures have become so great as to excite alarm in each of these principal nations of the world, causing enormous deficits in their current revenues, and necessitating new sources of taxation to meet the demands of a national ambition to excel in the construction of great armaments.

The total expenditures of the United States, England, Germany, and France during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, on account of their armies and navies, approximated, in round numbers, a billion, or ten hundred million, dollars. Add to this the sums expended for the same purpose by other nations of the world and you will have a grand total cost of armed peace so large that the human mind can scarcely comprehend it.

While this cost is so enormous as to be almost beyond the comprehension of man, yet an approximate idea of such cost may be gathered from the annual expenditures which we as a nation are making for this purpose and the rapidity with which these expenditures have increased in recent years. Our total expenditures for the army, navy, and fortifications in the fiscal year 1908 aggregated \$204,122,855.57, or 36.5 per cent of our total revenue, exclusive of postal receipts, which are not included for the purpose of comparison, as the postal revenues and expenditures are a balanced account. Our expenditures during the same year on account of wars past, including all objects for which appropriations are made on that account, were \$180,678,204, or 31 per cent of our total revenues.

According to the daily statement of the Treasury Department at Washington on April 30, 1909, we have thus far during this fiscal year collected from all sources, except postal receipts, \$493,027,989.69. Up to that date we had expended on account of the army \$110,107,924.96; on account of the navy, \$96,376,012.41, a total of \$206,483,937.37. Therefore we have expended this fiscal year on account of preparation for war 41 per cent of all our revenues, and on account of wars past 31 per cent of all our revenues, or a total expenditure of 72 per cent of all the revenues thus far collected during the current fiscal year on account of wars it is said we are preparing to avoid and wars which we have had in the past.

But this startling statement does not indicate that we have yet reached the maximum cost of armed peace. The expenditures for this purpose the coming fiscal year will be greater than they are this year. They have been increasing rapidly and enormously year by year, not only with us, but with all the principal nations of the world. None of the advocates of armed peace are willing to suggest a limit beyond which this increase shall not go.

The average annual appropriations for our army have leaped from less than \$24,000,000 for each of the eight years immediately preceding the Spanish war to more than \$83,000,000 for each of the eight years ending with the appropriations made at the last session of Congress for the fiscal year 1910. During the same period the average annual appropriations for our navy have increased from a little more than \$27,500,000 to more than \$102,400,000. In other words, the increase in appropriations for the army for the periods named exceeded \$472,000,000, a sum sufficient to cover the whole cost of constructing the Panama Canal, with nearly \$150,000,000 to spare. The increase in the sums appropriated for the navy for these same periods is approximately \$600,000,000, a sum largely in excess of the total appropriations for the support of our entire Government for any fiscal year prior to that of 1898.



The combined increase in the appropriations for the army and the navy for the eight-year periods named amounts to \$1,072,000,000, a sum exceeding by more than \$158,000,000 the total interest-bearing debt of the United States. So great has been the increase in this cost of armed peace these last eight years over the eight years ending scarcely ten years ago that the sum total of the increase is even larger than the stupendous sum appropriated for all governmental purposes for the fiscal year 1910.

The fact that we are expending, during this fiscal year, 72 per cent of our aggregate revenue in preparing for war and on account of past wars, leaving only 28 per cent of our revenue available to meet all other governmental expenditures, including internal improvements, the erection of public buildings, the improvement of rivers and harbors, and the conservation of our natural resources, is to my mind appalling. It should arrest the attention of the American people and not only cause them to demand a decrease in these unnecessary war expenditures, but also prompt them to aid in every way possible in the creation of a public sentiment that would favor the organization of an international federation whose decisions and action in the peaceful settlement of controversies between nations would be recognized and accepted as the final determination thereof. If this were done it would not necessarily mean the entire abandonment of armies and navies, but it would so far remove the possibility of international wars as to make unnecessary the expenditure of the stupendous sums which are now being collected from the people in the form of taxes and expended for the purpose of maintaining armed peace.

The money expended for this purpose is not the only measure of the cost of armed peace. Think for a moment of what the American people have lost during the past eight years in consequence of the increased expenditure of more than a billion dollars during that time for the purpose of preparing for war in order that war may be prevented.

The most enthusiastic advocates of river and harbor improvements do not estimate that the cost of these improvements would exceed \$500,000,000, only half the amount which we have collected in taxes from the people and expended in war preparation during the last eight years in excess of the amount expended for the same purpose during the eight years preceding 1898. The other half of this enormous increase might well have been expended in other directions which would have contributed to the permanent advancement of the vast and varied interests of 90,000,000 of people.

In conclusion permit me to say that while I thoroughly believe in the wisdom and practicability of an international federated state for the exercise of delegated power in the authoritative determination of international disputes, I am not one of those peace enthusiasts who think the time is near at hand when the world will witness the disarmament of nations. But I do maintain that the time is now here when the people of the principal naval powers of the world, and especially the people of the United States, must come to the support of those who are contending against the advocates of armed peace and who are striving to check the extravagant and wasteful expenditure of public money in competitive construction of needless and useless armaments. If they do not, the burdens of unnecessary taxation will continue to increase until they ultimately impoverish the people and exhaust the resources of their nations.

ADDRESS OF DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, AT THE MOHONK LAKE CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION, MAY 19, 1909.

Two years ago when I last had the honor of addressing this conference as its presiding officer we were all looking forward with confidence and high anticipation to the second Hague Conference, then soon to assemble. We were much concerned with the programme of business to be laid before that conference, and with the forms of agreement or declaration which we hoped would there be decided upon. In particular, emphasis was laid upon the desire, widely entertained by right-thinking men, that the second Hague Conference should take the steps necessary to build up a truly judicial international tribunal, by the side of or in succession to the semidiplomatic tribunal which had been the fruit of the first conference at The Hague; and that the conference should, itself, provide for its reassembling at stated intervals thereafter, without waiting for the specific call or invitation of any monarch or national executive. The history of the second Hague Conference is still fresh in our minds. Although not everything was done that we had hoped for, yet when the cloud of discussion lifted we could plainly see that long steps in advance had been taken, and that there was coming to be a more fundamental and far-



reaching agreement among the nations as to what was wise and practicable in the steady substitution of the rule of justice for the rule of force among men.

To-day, however, the most optimistic observer of the movement of public opinion in the world, and the most stoutly convinced advocate of international justice, must confess himself perplexed, if not amazed, by some of the striking phenomena which meet his view. Expenditure for naval armaments is everywhere growing by leaps and bounds.

Edmund Burke said that he did not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people; but perhaps it may be easier to detect some of the signs of emotional insanity than to draw an indictment for crime. The storm center of the world's weather to-day is to be found in the condition of mind of a large portion of the English people. The nation which, for generations, has contributed so powerfully to the world's progress in all that relates to the spread of the rule of law, to the peaceful development of commerce and industry, to the advancement of letters and science, and to the spread of humanitarian ideas, appears to be possessed for the moment—it can only be for the moment—with the evil spirit of militarism. It is hard to reconcile the excited and exaggerated utterances of responsible statesmen in Parliament and on the platform; the loud beating of drums and the sounding of alarms in the public press, even in that portion of it most given to sobriety of judgment; and the flocking of the populace to view a tawdry and highly sensational drama of less than third-rate importance for the sake of its contribution to their mental obsession by hobgoblins and the ghosts of national enemies and invaders, with the traditional temperament of a nation that has acclaimed the work of Howard, Wilberforce, and Shaftesbury, whose public life was so long dominated by the lofty personality of William Ewart Gladstone, and of which the real heroes to-day are the John Milton and the Charles Darwin, whose anniversaries are just now celebrated with so much sincerity and genuine appreciation.

What has happened? If an opinion may be ventured by an observer whose friendliness amounts to real affection, and who is, in high degree, jealous of the repute of the English people and of their place in the van of the world's civilization, it is that this lamentable outburst is attendant upon a readjustment of relative position and importance among the nations of the earth, due to economic and intellectual causes, which readjustment is interpreted in England, unconsciously, of course, in terms of the politics of the first Napoleon, rather than in terms of the politics of the industrial and intelligent democracies of the twentieth century. Germany is steadily gaining in importance in the world, and England is, in turn, losing some of her long-standing relative primacy. The causes are easy to discover, and are in no sense provocative of war or strife. Indeed, it is highly probable that war, if it should come with all its awful consequences, would only hasten the change it was entered upon to prevent.

It must not be forgotten that while there has long existed in Europe a German people, yet the German nation as such is a creation of very recent date. With the substantial completion of German political unity after the Franco-Prussian war, there began an internal development in Germany even more significant and more far-reaching in its effects than that which was called into existence by the trumpet voice of Fichte, after the disastrous defeat of the Prussian army by Napoleon at Jena, and guided by the hands of Stein and Hardenberg. This later development has been fundamentally economic and educational in character, and has been directed with great skill toward the development of the nation's foreign commerce, the husbanding of its own natural resources, and the comfort and health of the masses of its rapidly growing population.

Within a short generation the pressure of German competition has been severely felt in the trade and commerce of every part of the world. The two most splendid fleets engaged in the Atlantic carrying trade fly the German flag. Along either coast of South America, in the waters of China and Japan, in the ports of the Mediterranean, and on the trade routes to India and Australia, the German flag has become almost as familiar as the English. The intensive application of the discoveries of theoretical science to industrial processes has made Germany, in a sense, the world's chief teacher in its great international school of industry and commerce. With this over-sea trade expansion has gone the building of a German navy. It appears to be the building of this navy which has so excited many of the English people. For the moment we are not treated to the well-worn paradox that the larger a nation's navy the less likely it is to be used in combat and the more certain is the peace of the world. The old Adam asserts himself long enough to complain, in this case, at least, that if a navy is building in Germany it must be intended for offensive use; and against whom could the Germans possibly intend to use a navy except



against England? Their neighbors, the French and the Russians, they could readily, and with less risk, overrun with their great army. The United States is too far away to enter into the problem as a factor of any real importance. Therefore the inference is drawn that the navy must be intended for an attack upon England. It is worth while noting that, on this theory, the German navy now building appears to be the first of modern navies intended for military uses. It alone of all the world's navies, however large, however costly, is not a messenger of peace.

One must needs ask, then, what reason is to be found in the nature of the German people, in the declarations of their responsible rulers, or in the political relations between Germany and any other nation, for the belief that the German navy alone, among all modern navies, is building for a warlike purpose? Those of us who feel that the business of navy building is being greatly overdone, and that it can not for a moment be reconciled with sound public policy or with the increasingly insistent demand for social improvements and reforms, may well wish that the German naval programme were much more restricted than it is. But, waiving that point for the moment, what ground is there for the suspicion which is so widespread in England against Germany, and for the imputation to Germany of evil intentions toward England? Speaking for myself, and making full use of such opportunities for accurate information as I have had, I say with the utmost emphasis and with entire sincerity that I do not believe there is any ground whatever for those suspicions or for those imputations. Nor, what is more important, has adequate ground for those suspicions and imputations been given by any responsible person.

Are we to believe, for example, that the whole public life in both Germany and England is part of an *opéra bouffe*, and that all the public declarations of responsible leaders of opinion are meaningless or untrue? Are the increasingly numerous international visits of municipal officials, of clergymen, of teachers, of trades unionists, of newspaper men, as well as the cordial and intimate reception given them by their hosts, all a sham and a pretense? Have all these men daggers in their hands and subtle poisons in their pockets? Are we to assume that there is no truth or frankness or decency left in the world? Are nations in the twentieth century, and nations that represent the most in modern civilization at that, so lost to shame that they fall upon each other's necks and grasp each other's hands and swear eternal fealty as conditions precedent to making an unannounced attack upon each other during a fog? Even the public morality of the sixteenth century would have revolted at that. The whole idea is too preposterous for words, and it is the duty of the thoughtful and sincere friends of the English people, in this country and in every country, to use every effort to bring them to see the unreasonableness, to use no stronger term, of the attitude toward Germany which they are at present made to assume.

But, says the objector, England is an island nation. Unless she commands the sea absolutely her national existence is in danger; any strong navy in hands that may become unfriendly threatens her safety. Therefore she is justified in being suspicious of any nation that builds a big navy. That formula has been repeated so often that almost everybody believes it. There was a time when it was probably, and within limits, true. One can not but wonder, however, whether it is true any longer. In the first place, national existence does not now depend upon military and naval force. Italy is safe; so are Holland and Portugal, Mexico and Canada. Then, the possibilities of aerial navigation alone, with the resulting power of attacking a population or a fleet huddled beneath a cloud of monsters traveling through the air and willing to risk their own existence and the lives of their occupants for the opportunity to approach near enough to enable a vital injury to be inflicted upon another people, to say nothing of the enginery of electricity, have changed the significance of the word "island." Although an island remains, as heretofore, a body of land entirely surrounded by water, yet that surrounding water is no longer to be the only avenue of approach to it, its possessions, and its inhabitants. Even if we speak in the most approved language of militarism itself, it is apparent that a fleet a mile wide will not long protect England from attack or invasion, or from starvation, if the attacking or invading party is in command of the full resources of modern science and modern industry. But if justice be substituted for force, England will always be safe; her achievements for the past thousand years have made that certain.

The greatest present obstacle to the limitation of the armaments under the weight of which the world is staggering toward bankruptcy; the greatest



obstacle to carrying forward those social and economic reforms for which every nation is crying out, that its population may be better housed, the public health more completely protected, and the burden of unemployment lifted from the backs of the wage-earning classes, appears to many to be the insistence by England on what it calls the "two-power naval standard." So long as the British Empire circles the globe and so long as its ships and its goods are to be found in every port, the British navy will, by common consent, be expected to be much larger and more powerful than that of any other nation. Neither in France nor in Germany nor in Japan nor in America would that proposition be disputed. Even the two-power standard might not bring poverty and distress and wasteful expenditure to other nations if naval armaments were limited by agreement or were diminishing in strength. But, insisted upon in an era of rapidly increasing armaments, in this day of *Dreadnoughts*, the two-power standard leads, and must inevitably lead, to huge programmes of naval construction in every nation where the patriotism and good sense of the people do not put a stop to this modern form of madness. The practical sense of the world is against it; only so-called "expert theories" are on its side.

Under the prodding of alarmists in Parliament and the press a Liberal ministry has been compelled to say that it would propose and support measures for naval aggrandizement and expenditure based upon the principle that the fighting strength of the British navy must be kept always one-tenth greater than the sum total of the fighting strength of the two next most powerful navies in the world. At first it was even proposed to include the navy of the United States in making this computation. Later that position was fortunately retreated from. But it will be observed that in computing the so-called "two-power standard" the English jingoes count as contingent enemies the French and the Japanese, with both of whom their nation is in closest alliance, and also the Russians, with whom the English are now on terms of cordial friendship. In other words, unless all such treaties of alliance and comity are a fraud and a sham, these nations, at least, should be omitted from the reckoning. This would leave no important navy save that of Germany to be counted in possible opposition. For this reason, it is just now alike the interest and the highest opportunity for service of America and of the world to bring about the substitution of cordial friendship between England and Germany for the suspicion and distrust which so widely prevail. When this is done, a long step toward an international agreement for the limitation of armaments will have been taken; new progress can then be made in the organization of the world on those very principles for which the English themselves have time-long stood, and for whose development and application they have made such stupendous sacrifices and performed such herculean service.

If America were substituted for England, it would be difficult to see how any responsible statesman who had read the majority and minority reports recently laid before Parliament by the poor-law commission could for one moment turn aside from the stern duty of national protection against economic, educational, and social evils at home to follow the will-o'-the-wisp of national protection against a nonexistent foreign enemy. England to-day, in her own interest, needs to know Germany better; to learn from Germany, to study with care her schools and universities, her system of workingmen's insurance, of old-age pensions, of accident insurance, of sanitary and tenement-house inspection and reform, and all her other great social undertakings, rather than to spend time and energy and an impoverished people's money in the vain task of preparing, by monumental expenditure and waste, to meet a condition of international enmity which has only an imaginary existence. It is the plain duty of the friends of both England and Germany—and what right-minded man is not the warm friend and admirer of both these splendid peoples—to exert every possible influence to promote a better understanding of each of these peoples by the other, a fuller appreciation of the services of each to modern civilization, and to point out the folly, not to speak of the wickedness, of permitting the seeds of discord to be sown between them by any element in the population of either.

I like to think that the real England and the real Germany found voice on the occasion of a charming incident which it was my privilege to witness in September of last year. At the close of the impressive meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, held in Berlin, the German imperial chancellor offered the gracious and bountiful hospitality of his official residence to the hundreds of representatives of foreign parliamentary bodies then gathered in the German capital. Standing under the spreading trees of his own great gardens, surrounded by the leaders of German scholarship and of German political thought, Prince von



Bülow was approached by more than two score members of the British Parliament, with Lord Weardale at their head. In a few impressive, eloquent, and low-spoken sentences Lord Weardale expressed to the chancellor what he believed to be the real feeling of England toward Germany, and what he felt should be the real relationship to exist between the two Governments and the two peoples. In words equally cordial and quite as eloquent, Prince von Bülow responded to Lord Weardale with complete sympathy and without reserve. The incident made a deep impression upon the small group who witnessed it. It was over in a few minutes. It received no record in the public press, but in my memory it remains as a weighty and, I hope, as a final refutation of the widespread impression that England and Germany are at bottom hostile, and are drifting inevitably toward the maelstrom of an armed conflict. What could more surely lead to conviction of high crimes and misdemeanors at the bar of history than for two cultured peoples, with political and intellectual traditions in their entirety unequaled in the world's history, in this twentieth century to tear each other to pieces like infuriated gladiators in a bloody arena? The very thought is revolting, and the mere suggestion of it ought to dismay the civilized world.

The aim of all rational and practicable activity for the permanent establishment of the world's peace, and for the promotion of justice, is and must always be the education of the world's public opinion. Governments, however popular and however powerful, have ceased to dominate; everywhere public opinion dominates governments. As never before, public opinion is concerning itself with the solution of grave economic and social questions which must be solved aright if the great masses of the world's population are to share comfort and happiness. A nation's credit means the general belief in its ability to pay in the future. That nation which persistently turns away from the consideration of those economic and social questions upon which the productive power of its population must in last resort depend, limits and eventually destroys its own credit. That nation which insists, in response to cries more or less inarticulate and to formulas more or less outworn, upon spending the treasure taken from its population in taxes upon useless and wasteful armaments, hastens its day of doom, for it impairs its credit or ultimate borrowing capacity in a double way. It not only expends unproductively and wastefully vast sums of the nation's taxes, but it substitutes this unproductive and wasteful expenditure for an expenditure of equal amount, which might well be both productive and uplifting. The alternative to press upon the attention of mankind is that of huge armaments or social and economic improvement. The world can not have both. There is a limit to man's capacity to yield up taxes for public use. Economic consumption is now heavily taxed everywhere. Accumulated wealth is being sought out in its hiding places, and is constantly being loaded with a heavier burden. All this can not go on forever. The world must choose between pinning its faith to the symbols of a splendid barbarism and devoting its energies to the tasks of an enlightened civilization.

Despite everything, the political organization of the world in the interest of peace and justice proceeds apace. The movement is as sure as that of an Alpine glacier, and it has now become much more easily perceptible.

There is to be established at The Hague beyond any question, either by the next Hague conference or before it convenes, by the leading nations of the world, acting along the lines of the principles adopted at the Second Hague Conference two years ago, a high court of international justice. It is as clearly indicated as anything can be that that court is to become the supreme court of the nations of the world.

The Interparliamentary Union, which has within a few weeks adopted a permanent form of organization, and chosen a permanent secretary, whose headquarters are to be in the Peace Palace at The Hague itself—an occurrence of the greatest public importance, which has, to my knowledge, received absolutely no mention in the press—now attracts to its membership representatives of almost every parliamentary body in existence. At the last meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, held in Berlin, the parliament of Japan, the Russian Douma, and the newly organized Turkish parliament were all represented. By their side sat impressive delegations from the parliaments of England, of France, of Germany, of Austria-Hungary, of Italy, of Belgium, of the Netherlands, and of the Scandinavian nations, as well as 8 or 10 representatives of the American Congress. In this Interparliamentary Union, which has now passed through its preliminary or experimental stage, lies the germ of a coming federation of the world's legislatures which will be established in the near



future, and whose powers and functions, if not precisely defined at first, will grow naturally from consultative to that authority of which wisdom and justice can never be divested. Each year that the representatives of a national parliament sit side by side with the representatives of the parliaments of other nations, look their colleagues in the face, and discuss with them freely and frankly important matters of international concern, it will become more difficult for them to go back and vote a declaration of war against the men from whose consultation room they have but just come. Among honest men, familiarity breeds confidence, not contempt.

Where, then, in this coming political organization of the world, is the international executive power to be found? Granting that we have at The Hague an international court; granting that we have sitting, now at one national capital and now at another, what may be called a consultative international parliament, in what direction is the executive authority to be looked for? The answer to this vitally important question has been indicated by no less an authority than Senator Root, in his address before the American Society of International Law, more than a year ago. Mr. Root then referred to the fact that because there is an apparent absence of sanction for the enforcement of the rules of international law, great authorities have denied that those rules are entitled to be classed as law at all. He pointed out that this apparent inability to execute in the field of international politics a rule agreed upon as law, seems to many minds to render quite futile the further discussion of the political organization of the world. Mr. Root, however, had too practical, as well as too profound, a mind to rest content with any such lame and impotent conclusion. He went on to show, as he readily could, that nations, day by day, yield to arguments which have no compulsion behind them, and that, as a result of such argument, they are constantly changing policies, modifying conduct, and offering redress for injuries. Why is this? Because, as Mr. Root pointed out, the public opinion of the world is the true international executive. No law, not even municipal law, can long be effective without a supporting public opinion. It may take its place upon the statute book, all constitutional and legislative requirements having been carefully complied with; yet it may, and does, remain a dead letter unless public opinion cares enough about it, believes enough in it, to vitalize it and to make it real.

In this same direction lies the highest hope of civilization. What the world's public opinion demands of nations or of international conferences it will get. What the world's public opinion is determined to enforce will be enforced. The occasional brawler and disturber of the peace in international life will one day be treated as is the occasional brawler and disturber of the peace in the streets of a great city. The aim of this conference, and of every gathering of like character, must insistently and persistently be the education of the public opinion of the civilized world.

The world is being politically organized while we are talking about it and wondering how it is to be done and when it is to come to pass. Little by little the steps are taken, now in the formulation of a treaty, now in the instructions given to representatives at an international conference, now in the new state of mind brought about by the participation in international gatherings and the closer study of international problems, until one day the world will be surprised to find how far it has traveled by these successive short steps. We need not look for any great revolutionary or evolutionary movement that will come suddenly. A revolutionary movement would not be desirable, and evolutionary movements do not come in that way. Slowly, here a little, there a little, line upon line, and precept upon precept, will the high ethical and political ideals of civilized man assert themselves and take on such forms as may be necessary to their fullest accomplishment.

We Americans have a peculiar responsibility toward the political organization of the world. Whether we recognize it or not, we are universally looked to, if not to lead in this undertaking, at least to contribute powerfully toward it. Our professions and our principles are in accord with the highest hopes of mankind. We owe it to ourselves, to our reputation, and to our influence that we do not by our conduct belie those principles and those professions; that we do not permit selfish interests to stir up among us international strife and ill feeling; that we do not permit the noisy boisterousness of irresponsible youth, however old in years or however high in place, to lead us into extravagant expenditure for armies and navies; and that, most of all, we shall cultivate at home and in our every relation, national and international, that spirit of justice which we urge so valiantly upon others. *Si vis pacem, para pacem!*



THE WRONG PATH—SPEECH OF MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF  
THE NEW YORK PEACE SOCIETY ON APRIL 21, 1909.

Consider the world situation to-day. Individually the world has advanced in every respect. Physically, intellectually, morally the race has everywhere risen. Conditions of human life have improved and the sentiment of brotherhood has begun to take root as the various peoples have come to know each other. All this strengthens the faith we hold that progress, development, is the law of man's being—that which is, better than what has been; that to come, better than what is; no limit to man's upward ascent.

So much for man viewed individually.

When we come to consider him nationally, all is reversed. The chief nations of Europe have recently retrograded and are now spending nearly one-half of all their revenues arming themselves against each other as if mankind were still in the savage state.

Fresh clouds have just risen upon the horizon. Never in our day has the world's peace been so seriously threatened. We have been assured that "an overpowering army and navy is the cheap insurance of nations;" that "peace is secured by nations arming themselves until they are too powerful to be attacked;" and "if you wish peace, prepare for war."

These maxims the chief nations have long followed, ever building new and more destructive weapons, yet their relative positions remain substantially the same. None are more secure from attack than before; on the contrary, the danger of war has increased as their attitude as jealous rivals arming themselves against each other has become more and more pronounced. Britain spent upon army and navy last year \$345,000,000, most of this upon her navy; Germany \$233,000,000, about half upon the navy; our peaceful Republic expended upon army, navy, and war pensions no less than \$470,000,000.

Never were nations as busy as to-day in the hopeless task of becoming "too powerful to be attacked." Britain has just discovered in Germany a menace to her existence. Germany, having equal rights upon the sea, fails to recognize the right of Britain to remain a menace to her, which she long has been, claiming to be "mistress of the seas." The United States, no longer free from naval conditions, is in no mood to remain menaced by any power. France and Japan are building *Dreadnoughts* which "have returned to plague the inventor," and Russia is about to follow. Italy is to build two. Last of all, Austria announces she has resolved to build three *Dreadnoughts*. Ominous decision, indeed; suggestive of German alliance. Europe has awakened at last to the presence of impending danger.

Britain and Germany are the principal contestants. Britain has a strong case. She can not feed her people if supplies of food be interrupted on the sea. The fear of starvation would instantly create panic, and general pillage of food supplies would ensue. She is powerless without open ports and open sea. Hence she claims she must possess overwhelming fleets and must oppose the great advance which the other powers urge—the immunity of commerce upon the sea.

Germany also has a case quite strong enough to give her the loyal support of the nation. She also can not feed her people and has to import food largely. Articles of food were imported in 1906 to the value of over \$1,100,000,000. In a contest her danger from lack of food supplies would be serious indeed, were imports by sea prevented. Hence she also feels that she must possess an all-sufficient navy.

Nations are only aggregations of men, and the history of man proves the folly of arming themselves in the vain hope of securing immunity from attack. California is one of the most recent examples. Her gold mines attracted hardy adventurers from all parts of the world. Courts of justice were unknown. The maxims quoted above were followed for a time, each individual resolving to become "too powerful to be attacked" and arming himself as the best means of securing peace and safety. The result was entirely the reverse, as it has proved to be with nations. The more men armed themselves the greater the number of deadly feuds. There was no peace. Anarchy was imminent. The best element arose and reversed this policy. At first the vigilance committee, a rude court, was formed of the most enlightened citizens, which was soon superseded by regular courts of law. Only when the arming of men was not permitted did the reign of peace begin. Thus was that community led to peace under law, by disarmament, and thus only can international peace be finally established and nations rest secure under a police force to maintain, never to break, the peace.

Europe is at last realizing the danger into which the policy of mutual arming has led, but is slow to see that there is but one mode of escape, and that through concurrent action of some or most of the naval powers.



Within a small radius the two gigantic fleets of Britain and Germany will operate, often in sight of each other. The topic of constant discussion in every ship will be their relative power and the consequences of battle. The crews of the respective navies will regard each other with suspicion, jealousy, and hatred, in this representing only too truly the feelings of their countrymen. Under such strain a mere spark will suffice. A few marines ashore from two of the ships, British and German, would be enough; a few words pass between them; an encounter between two begins, both probably under the influence of liquor; one is wounded, blood is shed, and the pent-up passions of the people of both countries sweep all to the winds. The governments are too weak to withstand the whirlwind; or, being men of like passions with their fellows, probably are in part swept away themselves after years of jealous rivalry into thirst for revenge. Such the probable result; given national jealousy and hatred, any trifle suffices to produce war.

War has seldom an adequate cause. It is usually stimulated by invidious comparisons as to relative strength and warlike qualities, which render nations suspicious of each other.

The real issue between nations usually matters little. The spirit in which nations approach each other to effect peaceful settlement is everything. No difference too trifling to create war; none too serious for peaceful adjustment. The disposition is all. Secretary Root gave full expression to this vital truth in his address in Washington at the laying of the foundation stone of the Bureau of American Republics. It is one of the many valid objections to the policy of armament that every increase of naval and military power is in the nature of a challenge to other powers, which arouses their jealousy and their fears, rendering them less disposed to settle peacefully any difference that may arise.

But even if a collision be miraculously avoided, the guiltless, peace-loving naval powers of the world in turn will have been compelled to embark upon the building of excessive navies, many of these obtained and maintained only by extorting millions from people already bordering upon the brink of starvation. A fatal objection to the policy of securing peace through increasing armaments is that success is only attainable by exhausting the resources of rivals, a mutually destructive task, probably ending in exhausting both belligerents; failing that, it results in an armed truce, under which the nations are in perpetual fear of attack, each straining its resources to increase its armament, as they are to-day.

Hence, to save nations from themselves there must sooner or later emerge from the present unparalleled increase of armaments a league of peace, embracing the most advanced nations, proclaiming that since the world has now shrunk into a neighborhood and is in instantaneous communication, its total commerce yearly exceeding \$28,000,000,000, all civilized nations are deeply interested in world peace, and that the time has passed when any one or two nations can be permitted to break it. Their disputes must be arbitrated. Civilized nations have now acquired a common right to be consulted when the peace of the world is at stake, and the crime of man killing man, the crime of crimes, is threatened.

The late prime minister of Britain, in his speech to the Interparliamentary Union in London two years ago, advocated such a league, which would naturally be followed in due course by the international supreme court. This court the last Hague Conference approved in principle unanimously, differing only upon the manner of selecting the judges which is surely a detail not impossible of solution.

The only alternative is an anxious period of ever-increasing armaments and feverish unrest, probably ending in devastating wars, mutually destructive, and sowing the poisonous seeds of jealousy, distrust, and mutual hatred, parents of future wars in generations to come. For what can war but other wars breed?

Meanwhile, let us congratulate ourselves upon the world having moved one step forward. Whatever solution may be found of the war specter now so luridly appearing before us, this we now know—it can not be through increased armaments. The last few weeks have torn that supposed panacea into fragments. There is nothing left of it. But it has served this great end: It has brought the nations face to face at last with the truth that increased armaments of one mean increased armaments of others, with no gain to either. On the contrary, their rivalry is intensified and the dangers of war greater than before. When either men or nations differ, if one begins to arm the other loses no time in also grasping his weapon. Peace flies when arming begins. Thus the fallacy that



increased armaments insure peace is exploded and another policy must soon be tried.

Let us remember that Britain and Germany are only two of the naval powers. Our own country to-day is as a naval power second in rank, and there are other powers which have a right to be heard in this crisis dangerous to all, since all are forced to suffer under present conditions. Is our peace-loving Congress, which has shown a wise reluctance for years to any great increase of battle ships, to be compelled to reverse its pacific policy and increase our fleet solely because of British and German rivalry, from which we have a right to be free? The nations which have resisted wasting their revenues upon armies and navies and which wish to continue this pacific policy have rights in this matter. It can not be doubted that our President and Secretary of State are to-day gravely concerned about this momentous question.

We have no right to assume that either Germany or Britain would decline a conference or refuse to consider a league of peace proposed by the late prime minister of Britain; but whatever might be the result, we should be able to fix the responsibility for consequences upon the real disturber of the world's peace. The peaceful nations have a right to know the guilty nation or nations, whether one or more—heavy, indeed, will be the responsibility of the guilty.

It seems preeminently the mission of our peaceful industrial Republic, which most frequently lies beyond the vortex of militarism which engulfs Europe, to lead the world to the reign of peace under law. She it was who led The Hague Conference in urging an international supreme court. Her Congress, alone among the chief nations, has shown a wise moderation in voting from time to time only one-half the number of *Dreadnoughts* recommended by the Executive. She covets no new territory. On the contrary, she has relinquished control of Cuba, and is preparing the Filipinos for independence, and is at heart the friend of all nations. She has not to-day one open question with any nation, the last having recently been referred to The Hague court. She is preeminently the apostle of peaceful arbitration. Such is her peaceful policy. Such her example to the disturbing naval powers. One can not but indulge the hope that our President in due time may find a way open, without being intrusive, to exert his vast influence in favor of peace; to call the attention of the two disturbing powers to the fact that our country has a right to speak, if not to protest, in behalf of its own imperiled interests; and perhaps to invite the leading naval powers to consider whether some kind of agreement could not be now reached that would avert the appalling dangers which to-day threaten to convulse the world in the not distant future.

Meanwhile it is the duty of all our members, as haters of war and lovers of peace, to urge in season and out of season the precious truth that lasting peace is only to be attained by an international league of peace, prepared, if necessary, to enforce peace among erring nations, as we enforce obedience to law among erring men; this league finally to be perfected by an international supreme court. "To this complexion must it come at last."

Fellow-members of the Peace Society, we have found the right path. Let us keep to it and falter not. All will finally be well.

After the delivery of Mr. Carnegie's speech, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the society:

*Resolved*, That, in the opinion of the Peace Society of New York, the rivalry between Britain and Germany in constructing ships of war, the action of one being contingent upon that of the other; affects the position of the other naval powers so seriously as to call for their prompt consideration.

*Resolved*, That it should not be permissible for any power to compel all other naval powers to increase their armaments correspondingly, or, as the only alternative, to permit themselves to become practically defenseless.

*Resolved*, That we earnestly hope that the President of our Republic, whose peace-loving Congress has repeatedly refused to build more than one-half of the battle ships asked for by the Executive, may find it advisable to take the question into serious consideration, with a view to exert his vast influence to avert either of the two alternatives stated.

*Resolved*, That in the league of peace, suggested by the prime minister of Britain to the last Peace Conference in London, this society sees the true and most feasible solution of the problem.

---

ADDRESS OF HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT AT THE ARBITRATION CONFERENCE, MOHONK LAKE, N. Y., MAY 21, 1909.

If the President of the United States were to say to King Edward and Emperor William, "Let us keep the peace, and in case of any trouble between either two of our three countries let us not draw the sword until we have had an investigation by an impartial third party, be it power, commission, or court"—if, I say, President Taft were to make a formal proposal of this nature and



those two great monarchs were to grasp the outstretched hand, what would be the result? It would signify the end of war.

If this utterance should be published, I want it understood that it was made, not at a meeting of the unsophisticated by a "demagogue of peace," but at a conference of experts, by one who knows whereof he speaks. The distinguished members of this assemblage know that if the Government of the United States saw fit to take this course the other two nations would be only too willing to join hands with us, and they also know that all other powers would readily follow suit.

While we may differ as to whether the nations should first establish a system of international justice and then proceed to disarmament, or whether we should first reduce armaments and then establish law and order in place of the present state of anarchy in international relations, or strive for both reforms simultaneously, we are all headed for the same goal, and we are all agreed that peace should be maintained and its permanency guaranteed by law rather than by force, and its breach guarded against by binding international agreements. In other words, both the advocates of disarmament and the friends of arbitration are after identically the same result and will not fall out over the means to bring it about.

I shall not now speculate as to what the effect of President Taft's redeeming act would be. Suffice it to say that, as compared with its beneficent consequences, every event in the history of the human race would fade into insignificance. It would mean the emancipation of mankind from one of its greatest scourges and the dawn of a new epoch in the history of civilization, and posterity would, amidst the plaudits of the whole human family, adorn the brow of our President with the wreath of immortality.

It may well be asked why, if it is so easy, no President has yet undertaken to thus substitute peace by lawful agreement for peace by force? A book could be written to answer this question. In a word, conditions were not ripe. The burden of militarism, though oppressively great, had not become unbearable in either England or Germany, and we ourselves had not been spending 60 per cent of our total revenue for war, as we do now. But there is another even more potent reason. Water does not rise above its source. Governments can not take the risk of marching too far ahead of the procession of the governed, and the masses of the people here and elsewhere lacked enlightenment. Their justifiable prejudice in favor of the old order of things would not allow their eyes to be opened to the revelations of the new, revelations which, after all, emanated only from the inspiration of the few. Yet we know that great reforms must always come from the source of power, the people; they are rarely, if ever, handed down by those in authority, but must be handed up to the rulers by the people. While this is much easier in a democracy than in monarchies, and while, therefore, the initiative in this great movement should be taken by the United States, yet up to this time the voice of the people lacked that force and unanimity which alone can prompt governments to act.

Hence our duty is clear. We must give organized expression to the popular will. We must satisfy President Taft that the majority of the American people will applaud and the great heart of the Nation will beat for his new policy of emancipation. Therefore we should organize for peace in every congressional district and every State of the Union after the fashion of the so-called "Navy League" in Germany, with this difference: While the members of the German Navy League are pledged to support the Government in its policy to steadily increase the navy, the members of the American Peace League must pledge themselves to support the Government in its policy to establish a lawful peace, such as will be inviolate and secure as well from the transgressions of arbitrary power as from the passions of the people. Goethe said man is but an animal with a soul. While the Navy League appeals to the animal, let our Peace League appeal to the soul in man. As I said before, there should be a peace organization in every congressional district to make its influence felt with all the candidates for the National Legislature. These district organizations should then merge into state organizations, and finally into a great national body, whose power and influence will tend to shape legislation along peace lines and make Representatives, Senators, and even Presidents sit up and take notice. Business is with us because it can not prosper except in times of peace; labor is with us because it bears the burden and foots the bill of war; the farmer is with us because war decimates his customers and devastates the fruit of his labor; but, after all, these are only material considerations. The great and overshadowing moral reason why every well-meaning man and woman is with



us is that, in the language of Victor Hugo, "Peace is the virtue and war the crime of civilization." So it will be an easy task to convince the President and his counselors that "we are coming, Father William, many millions strong."

To those of us who are familiar with the progress of the cause of international justice and peace the evidence already at hand as to the world's sentiment regarding it seems even now sufficient to warrant a bold dash, by any democratic government, for final results. Two Hague conferences have met within the last ten years, and a third one has been agreed upon. Through these international councils all the governments of the world have been committed to the principle of arbitration, aye, even obligatory arbitration, and to the maintenance of a permanent tribunal of arbitral justice, a world supreme court. It is absolutely safe to construe this action of the allied nations as a mandate for further practical steps in the new arena of world politics. But this is not all. The national legislative bodies of the world have combined and formed an Interparliamentary Union to strive for permanent peace by arbitration, and already more than 2,000 members of the parliaments, in the American Congress more than one-half the total membership, belong to that great organization which, since its birth twenty years ago, has already held 15 international conferences. Of the 7 meetings of this union of lawmakers held during the last ten years I have had the honor to attend 6 as an American delegate, namely, those of Christiania, 1899; Vienna, 1903; St. Louis, 1904; Brussels, 1905; London, 1906; and Berlin, 1908, and I speak from personal observation when I say that enlightened Europe expects the United States to speak the redeeming word! The statesmen of that continent are convinced of our disinterestedness and righteousness, and are, therefore, willing to confide in and trust us. Held by monarchs in the iron grasp of militarism, they can not free themselves and look to democracy for salvation. They are fully conscious of the power, wealth, and resources of the United States, as well as of our superior ability to compete in armaments with any other country; hence the olive branch held out by an American President would not be regarded as an emblem of fear or weakness, but rather as an evidence of both our superior greatness and our genuine love of justice and peace. And permit me to add that as far as I know the state of the public mind in the larger countries of Europe from personal contact with their representative men, no monarch could or would reject an American offer of any practical peace agreement.

Assured, then, of a cordial reception by Great Britain and Germany of our peace offering, and of its enthusiastic approval by an enlightened public sentiment here as well as abroad, and conscious of its inestimable benefits to the whole human family, the United States has a mission to perform, as well defined as it is sublime. It seems to have been reserved to a President who is in himself the embodiment of the majesty of law, and is therefore peculiarly well equipped to give to the reign of law that wider scope which would include the relations between governments and peoples. To him it will plainly appear as the manifest destiny of law. The gradual extension of its rule from families to communities, from communities to provinces, from provinces to states, and from states to interstate and world-wide relations, so that the conduct of nations toward each other may be regulated the same as the conduct of individuals, is an evolution as inevitable as is the progress of civilization itself. The task, we are confident, will appeal most strongly to the eminent jurist who is now Chief Magistrate of the American Nation. And if he can be prevailed upon to repeat the immortal words of one of his predecessors, "Let us have peace," adding a new and world-wide significance to them, the luster of his name would be reflected to all the ages to come, and his immortal fame would be more securely assured than if he were the hero of a hundred battlefields.

A crisis is upon us. The nations, in wild alarm, are taking counsel of fear, and a suicidal rivalry in armaments is equally exhausting the resources of all without changing their relative strength in the least. The people are groaning both under the insufferable burden and the growing danger of war, and, realizing that there can neither be genuine liberty nor real happiness as long as this condition lasts, their eyes are turned hopefully to Washington, where once an emancipator, by one stroke of the pen, struck the shackles from 4,000,000 slaves. The hour of a new emancipation has struck. Will another President immortalize himself by emancipating all mankind from the thralldom of war? May an affirmative answer be recorded at the next conference at beautiful Lake Mohonk.

O